DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 748 JC 730 055

AUTHOR	Burne, Kevin
TITLE	Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to English Composition Instruction: Phases Two and Three.
INSTITUTION	Long Beach City Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Composition Skills (Literary); Data Analysis; Educational Research; *English Instruction; Essays; *Experimental Programs; *Instructional Innovation; Post Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Teaching Techniques; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	California; *Long Beach City College

ABSTRACT

Phases two and three of an evaluation of an innovative approach to English Composition instruction at Long Beach City College are reported. In the innovative approach, each class was divided into two groups of 15 students each, which met twice each week to discuss topics for writing, to read and revise first drafts of papers, and to discuss basic writing problems as they arose. In addition, the students were to spend one hour each week working on writing problems with teachers and teacher aides. In Phase Two, a comparison was made of 136 final essays of 150 students (67 TBA, i.e., experimental, and 69 traditional). All of the essays were written under controlled conditions. The results were tabulated on an essay score sheet which allowed tabulation of 7 rhetorical variables and 14 non-standard features; in addition a tabulation was made of total errors, error-word ratios, and error-sentence ratios. Analysis of the data is provided. The results of the analysis show that the non-TBA students were more successful in eliminating errors than were the TBA students. In Phase Three, performance in transfer-level English Composition (English 1A) was studied. Criterion variables used were: the tendency to enroll in transfer English Composition; the tendency to complete or persist in English 1A; the ratio of achievement grades earned; and the ratio of penalty grades earned. Results of the study showed that the traditional population demonstrated a greater tendency to enroll in the transfer composition course, the difference being at the .05 level of significance. It is concluded that both types of courses equally prepare students for transfer Freshman English. The Essay Score Sheet and tables are provided. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073748

LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Long Beach City College

Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to English Composition Instruction: Phases Two and Three

JC 130 055

Dr. Kevin Burne,
Division Chairman, and
Department Head (English)

George Becker
Research Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 3 0 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

January 1973
Approved for Distribution by Dr. Wiley D. Garner, President

Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to English Composition Instruction
Phase Two

Introduction. Last Spring, phase one of an evaluational study concerning a different approach to teaching writing skills at Long Beach City College was the subject of a research office report. In this initial phase, LBCC students in fall semester, 1971, English Composition courses were compared on the bases of final course grades, course withdrawal rate, and scores on a standardized English usage test. The written report describing phase one, which incidentally, has been included in the ERIC system files located at the University of California at Los Angeles, also suggested some other areas for additional study.

A comparison of final examination essays from students enrolled in spring semester, 1972, English Composition courses is the second phase in an evaluation of an innovative approach to English Composition instruction. To assess the merits of a student's essay, Dr. Kevin Burne, Language Arts Division Chairman, and Head of the English Department, devised an objective technique and accompanying record sheet to retain the scoring data. His procedure provides a means for controlling subjective bias frequently associated with essay grading practices, as well as a means for obtaining numerical scores which can be quantified and summarized.

As a result of Dr. Burne's expertise, and many hours of labor, the English Department has discovered some very objective, and rather interesting information about their new writing skills course. The following pages contain an analysis of phase two as reported by the English Department to the Vice President of Academic Affairs at Long Beach City College.

George Becker
Research Office

January 2, 1973

To: Bill Millington
From: Kevin Burne
Subject: A Comparison of Final Examination Essays of English 150 TBA and English 150, June, 1972

During the 1971-72 school year, the English Department instituted an experimental English 150 program to see if a discussion approach to the teaching of English 150 would be as effective in the teaching of writing as the traditional English 150. English 150 TBA would differ from the traditional course in that each class would be divided into two groups of fifteen students; each group would meet twice a week to discuss topics for writing, to read and revise first drafts of papers, and to discuss basic problems in writing as they arose. The students were to sign up for one hour per week in the Skills Center, at which time they would work on their writing problems with the help of teachers and teacher aides on duty and programs designed to meet their individual problems. The program was to be evaluated at the end of each semester. This study deals with only one part of that evaluation, a comparison of 136 final essays of 150 students: 67 TBA students and 69 regular 150 students, written in June, 1972.

All of the final essays were written in a 2 1/2 hour period under controlled conditions. The essays were written on specially marked paper, and they were numbered so that I would not know whether a particular essay was written by a TBA or regular student, nor would I know whether or not the student was recommended for English 1A. The results of my analysis were tabulated on an essay score sheet. After I completed the score sheet, it was marked for TBA or non-TBA and for acceptable for 1A and not acceptable for 1A. The data from the score sheet were then punched on IBM cards to be tabulated by a computer. The program used with the computer allowed for a tabulation of all of the items on the score sheet and correlations between TBA and non-TBA essays and between essays acceptable for 1A and essays unacceptable for 1A. T- and F- ratio tests were run to see whether or not any differences between groups were significant. T- and F- ratios can be considered significant only if they are .05 or less, that is, if they indicate that there is less than one chance in 20 that whatever results were achieved were a result of chance.

The score sheet allowed for a tabulation of seven rhetorical variables:

1. Number of paragraphs in essay
2. Number of sentences in essay
3. Number of words in essay
4. Number of sentences in body of essay expressing opinions
5. Number of sentences in body of essay expressing facts
6. Number of sentences per level of abstraction in each paragraph in body of essay
7. Number of topic sentences at abstract level 2 in the body of essay, given the thesis as level 1

The score sheet also allowed for a tabulation of 14 non-standard features:

1. Sentence fragment or run-on
2. Incorrect pronoun reference or agreement
3. Misplaced or dangling modifier
4. Non-agreement of subject and verb
5. Error in punctuation

6. Error in mechanics
7. Incorrect spelling
8. Error in parallel construction or coordination
9. Error in pronoun case
10. Error in verb form
11. Modifier problem
12. Anomalous syntax
13. Noun phrase deviation
14. Error in connector

In addition to these errors, a tabulation was made of total errors, error-word ratios and error-sentence ratios. There were 67 TBA and 69 non-TBA essays. One hundred twenty three acceptable and 13 non acceptable 1A essays. The following data are the results of the analysis:

Correlations

1. Number of paragraphs

	Mean	Sum	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	5.194	348	1.417	No
Non-TBA	5.145	355	1.581	No
1A	5.211	641	1.483	No
Non-1A	4.769	62	1.625	No

2. Sentences

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	27.373	1834	9.982	No
Non-TBA	28.275	1951	10.059	No
1A	28.268	3477	10.288	No
Non-1A	23.692	308	5.796	No

"Sentence" was defined in terms of student punctuation.

3. Words

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	508.164	34047	157.657	No
Non-TBA	464.623	32059	154.248	No
1A	498.024	61257	159.614	Yes
Non-1A	373.000	4849	64.382	Yes

Although TBA students wrote more words than did non-TBA, the difference is not significant. However, the difference between 1A and non-1A students is significant. It is interesting to note that a significant correlation was obtained here even though there was no significant correlation for the number of sentences produced, which indicates that non-1A students are writing shorter sentences.

4. Word--Sentence Ratio

This category compares the sentence length of the two groups.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	19.619	5.833	Yes
Non-TBA	16.859	3.313	Yes
1A	18.435	5.040	No
Non-1A	16.173	2.923	No

TBA students had a significantly higher word-sentence ratio than did Non-TBA students.

5. Opinions

For the purpose of this analysis, "fact" and "opinion" were defined as follows: a fact is either a statement of direct observation of either a primary or secondary source, or it is a statement about some inner condition, which does not need support, such as statements about tastes, feelings, and responses. Such a definition is not foolproof; some decisions had to be arbitrary.

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	3.164	212	3.267	No
Non-TBA	3.812	263	3.303	No
1A	3.423	421	3.254	No
Non-1A	4.154	54	3.655	No

6. Facts

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	4.119	276	4.686	No
Non-TBA	3.449	238	4.120	No
1A	3.967	488	4.521	No
Non-1A	2.00	26	2.746	No

In order to obtain a ratio of fact to opinion, I divided the mean number of opinions into the mean number of facts for each group. The ratio for TBA was 1.302, for Non-TBA .905, for 1A 1.159, and for Non-1A 2.077. It is strange that, in terms of the structure we claim to be teaching, the Non-1A students have a better ratio than have any of the other groups. One reason for this may be that Non-1A students depended more upon narration than did the other groups. A student who described what he did on his vacation would have a lot of facts, but they wouldn't necessarily support anything. At any rate, the ratio for all groups is very low, which leads to a question: are we really teaching 150 students how to support opinions with facts? The answer seems to be no. Even though one may question my definition of fact and opinion, it is at least one indication of what the students are doing. If a less stringent definition were applied, I don't think the results would vary significantly, but that is only a subjective judgment.

7. Density Level

The density ratio of the paragraphs in the body of the essay was determined by using Francis Christensen's notion of levels of abstraction as outlined in his Notes Toward a New Rhetoric. Basically, his notion is predicated on the fact that each sentence of a paragraph determines the constraints that are placed upon the sentence that follows; i.e., the next sentence can develop some part of the one(s) which precedes it, in which case it will be on a lower level of abstraction, or it can be coordinate to it, in which case it will be on the same level, or it can introduce some idea not related to the preceding sentence(s), in which case it will introduce a new level 1. A paragraph which is simply a series of unrelated sentences would never get beyond level 1, whereas a well developed paragraph will get to level 3, 4, or more. The density level in this analysis was determined by weighting each level of abstraction by multiplying the level of abstraction by the number of sentences at that level in the body of the paper. To use just one paragraph as an example, if the levels of the sentences were 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 3, 4, 4 respectively, the density level was determined as follows:

Level		Frequency	Weighted Score
1	X	1	1
2	X	1	2
3	X	2	6
4	X	4	16
		8	25

However, if the sentences were 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 1, the density level would be 9.

	Mean	Sum	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	18.295	1225.757	12.008	No
Non-TBA	29.833	2058.507	83.201	No
1A	25.261	3107.104	63.061	No
Non-1A	13.628	177.160	9.238	No

Although the T- and F- ratios for these figures fall far below the acceptable level, there does appear to be a pattern here, with non-1A students having paragraphs of less density than the other groups, TBA next, and so on. If I could hazard a guess as to why the density of Non-TBA essays had a higher density level than TBA, although the difference is not statistically significant, it would be that Non-TBA essays are more structured than TBA essays. Many of the essays were obviously structured to be five paragraphs: an introduction, three paragraphs in the body, and a conclusion. I don't know for sure whether or not that particular pattern is more prevalent in Non-TBA classes, but I would suppose that it is.

A weakness in this type of analysis became apparent to me as I read the papers. In a narrative paragraph, each succeeding sentence is of necessity based upon the one that comes before it in a time sequence. Thus an eight-sentence narrative paragraph would have the configuration 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Such a paragraph does not demonstrate the relationship between judgment and support that we expect in an expository paragraph, yet it has a high density rating. If this method of analysis is used again, I would suggest weighting narrative paragraphs in some other way. However, even allowing for the skewed weighting that occurred in these instances, the density levels of all groups were lower than they should be.

8. Topic sentences at level 2, given the thesis statement as level 1.

The levels of abstraction operate at the outline level as well as they do at the paragraph level. Thus a one-level outline would have a 1, 2, 2, 2...n pattern. The score obtained from analyzing these essays indicate only the topic sentences which support the thesis. Thus a low score here could indicate a poorly organized paper or a very short one.

	Mean	Sum	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	1.448	97	1.903	No
Non-TBA	1.232	85	1.643	No
1A	1.528	188	1.809	No
Non-1A	1.231	16	1.846	No

Although none of the correlations is significant, it is worth noting that the level for all categories falls below 2.0, the level that would ordinarily be expected if a paper containing two paragraphs supporting the thesis.

9. Fragments and Run-on Sentences

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	2.045	137	2.055	Yes
Non-TBA	1.232	85	1.643	Yes
1A	1.528	188	1.809	Yes
Non-1A	2.615	34	2.403	Yes

Significant scores were obtained for both groups being correlated: TBA and non-1A students wrote significantly more fragments and run-on sentences than Non-TBA and 1A students.

10. Incorrect Pronoun Reference or Agreement

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	.776	52	1.034	Yes
Non-TBA	.435	30	.909	Yes
1A	.618	76	1.00	No
Non-1A	.462	6	.843	No

The differences were significant between TBA and Non-TBA, with TBA making more errors, but they are not significant between 1A and Non-1A.

11. Misplaced or Dangling Modifiers

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	.254	17	.499	No
Non-TBA	.188	13	.459	No
1A	.228	28	.491	No
Non-1A	.154	2	.361	No

12. Non-Agreement of Subject and Verb

	Mean	Sum	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	.627	42	1.572	No
Non-TBA	.377	26	.818	No
1A	.472	58	1.271	No
Non-1A	.769	10	1.049	No

13. Error in Punctuation

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	7.866	527	4.40	Yes
Non-TBA	6.058	418	4.135	Yes
1A	7.057	868	4.351	No
Non-1A	5.923	77	4.341	No

TBA students had significantly more punctuation errors of all kinds than did Non-TBA.

14. Error in Mechanics

Mechanics includes all written symbols that do not reflect stress, juncture, or intonation changes in speech: capitalization, punctuation marks, underlining, etc.

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	4.164	279	3.290	Yes
Non-TBA	2.536	175	3.183	Yes
1A	3.325	409	3.385	No
Non-1A	3.462	45	2.845	No

TBA students had significantly more mechanics errors than did Non-TBA students.

15. Incorrect Spelling

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	4.567	306	3.168	Yes
Non-TBA	3.174	219	3.088	Yes
1A	3.756	462	3.093	No
Non-1A	4.846	63	3.978	No

TBA students had significantly more spelling errors than did Non-TBA students.

16. Error in Parallel Constructions and Coordination

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	1.030	69	1.184	Yes
Non-TBA	.507	35	.773	Yes
1A	.748	92	1.033	No
Non-1A	.923	12	.997	No

TBA students had significantly more errors in parallel constructions and coordination than did Non-TBA students.

17. Error in Pronoun Case

	Mean	Sum	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	.045	3	.269	No
Non-TBA	.087	6	.329	No
1A	.065	8	.306	No
Non-1A	.077	1	.266	No

Although the correlations for pronoun case are not significant, it is interesting to note the very low frequency of case errors for all groups. This would indicate either that these students have pretty well internalized case rules or that they avoid using constructions that make case a problem--or both. I would suppose the latter to be the case (no play on words intended).

18. Error in Verb Form

This category includes all verb errors other than agreement.

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	1.090	73	1.543	No
Non-TBA	1.014	70	1.838	No
1A	1.00	123	1.551	No
Non-1A	1.538	20	2.678	No

19. Modifier Problem

This category includes modifier problems other than dangling or misplaced modifiers: adjective-adverb confusion and problems with comparatives.

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	.627	42	.878	No
Non-TBA	.522	36	.878	No
1A	.577	71	.874	No
Non-1A	.538	7	.929	No

20. Anomalous Syntax

This category includes those constructions that cannot be produced from the rewrite rules of transformational-generative grammar. They are the type we mark "awk" or "Sentence Structure."

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	1.045	70	1.376	Yes
Non-TBA	.551	38	1.210	Yes
1A	.724	89	1.238	No
Non-1A	1.462	19	1.781	No

TBA students wrote significantly more anomalous structures than did Non-TBA students.

21. Noun-Phrase Deviation

This category includes all noun-phrase problems: a - an confusion, number problems, lack of genitive marker, etc.

	Mean	Sum	Standard Deviation	Significant
TBA	1.761	118	3.042	No
Non-TBA	1.072	74	2.567	No
1A	1.350	166	2.767	No
Non-1A	2.00	26	3.328	No

22. Error in Connectors--This category includes errors in the use of conjuntions, prepositions, and sentence connectors.

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	.642	43	1.193	No
Non-TBA	.478	33	.773	No
1A	.545	67	1.022	No
Non-1A	.692	9	.821	No

23. Total Errors

	Mean	Sum	S. D.	Significant
TBA	26.403	1769	13.775	Yes
Non-TBA	18.246	1259	12.457	Yes
1A	21.927	2697	13.302	No
Non-1A	25.462	331	17.032	No

TBA students produced significantly more total errors than did Non-TBA students.

24. Error-Word Ratio

This category compares the number of errors per word of the TBA and Non-TBA and the 1A and Non-1A groups so that those who had a higher possibility for error because they wrote longer papers would not be penalized.

	Mean	S. D.	Significant
TBA	.053	.025	Yes
Non-TBA	.040	.025	Yes
1A	.044	.023	Yes
Non-1A	.066	.039	Yes

Both TBA and Non-1A had a significantly higher error-word ratio than did the Non-TBA and the Non-1A.

Ranking of Error Frequency by Means--All Students

1.	Punctuation	13.924
2.	Spelling	7.741
3.	Mechanics	6.70
4.	Fragments and ROS	3.277
5.	Noun-Phrase Deviation	2.833
6.	Verb Deviation	2.014
7.	Anomalous Syntax	1.596
8.	Parallel Construction	1.537
9.	Modifier Deviation	1.149
10.	Pronoun Reference	1.211
11.	Connector Deviation	1.120
12.	S-V Agreement	1.004
13.	Dangling-Misplaced Modifier	.442
14.	Pronoun Case	.132

Conclusions

1. Rhetorical Variables

   A. TBA vs. Non-TBA
   There were no significant differences in 7 out of the 8 rhetorical variables: number of sentences, paragraphs, works, opinions, and facts; the density level of paragraphs, and the number of topic sentences that develop the thesis. However, TBA students had a higher word-per-sentence ratio than did non-TBA students, indicating that they wrote longer sentences.

   B. 1A vs. Non-1A
   There were no significant differences in 7 out of 8 rhetorical variables. However, non-1A students wrote fewer words per sentence, indicating that they wrote shorter sentences.

   C. Interpretation
   Any quantitative analysis of rhetorical patterns is certainly open to question, although there is an extensive bibliography which supports the notion that the structures of a paragraph and an essay can be quantified in several ways. The results of this analysis would indicate that we should take a closer look at how we are teaching exposition and argument in 150 and at what methods we are using to judge success. They also raise the question of whether or not teaching exposition and argument is a proper goal for 150. They also indicate that it makes little difference whether we use the methods of TBA or regular 150 to do the job.

2. Usage and Mechanics Variables

   A. TBA vs. Non-TBA
   Non-TBA students did better than TBA students in 7 out of the 14 usage and mechanics variables. They also did better in terms of total errors and error-word ratios. The totals in each category are significant because there was no significant difference in essay length. This is borne out in the higher error-to-word ratio of TBA students.

B. 1A vs. Non-1A

1A students did better than Non-1A students in only 1 out of the 14 usage and mechanics variables: run-on sentences and fragments. However, this lack of significant differences is predictable because Non-1A students wrote significantly shorter essays, as is also predictable. This difference is borne out in that Non-1A students had a significantly higher error-to-word ratio.

C. Interpretation

There is no question that Non-TBA students were more successful in eliminating errors than their TBA counterparts. The most obvious conclusion that we can assume from this difference is that teaching usage and mechanics pays off. Another is that TBA students did not make use of their assigned hour in the Skills Center to correct the errors marked upon their papers. Another is that they did use that hour, but classroom discussion of errors coupled with workbook assignments is a more effective means of helping students eliminate errors than is the individual help or the prepared programs used in the Skill Center. Another is that TBA methods place too much responsibility on the student to improve his own writing, a responsibility he is not ready for.

As I read the essays it became apparent that another measure should be used in evaluating student essays, a measure of the significance of the content. I don't know how we could arrive at such a measure in any way but to compare the subjective judgments of several readers until they could agree at least at the 75% level. A committee within the English Department at Long Beach State has included such a measure and have exchanged their responses so that they achieve 78% agreement on credit-by-examination essays they read for their Advanced Composition courses. It would seem that significance of content is too important a criterion to omit from any essay evaluation.

In evaluating the relative merits of TBA vs. Non-TBA methods, we must look at the results of this analysis as one part, an important part, of a more thorough evaluation, which should include a follow-up study of the relative success of TBA and Non-TBA students in 1A, relative drop-out records in 150 and 1A, and subjective responses of students and teachers involved in the TBA program.

ESSAY SCORE SHEET
FOR ENGLISH 150 TBA STUDY

TBA_____
Non-TBA_____
Student Number_____

Acceptable for 1A_____
Not Acceptable _____

I. Organization and Content
Directions: Place the numerical count for items 1-5 below on the line provided.

_____1. Number of paragraphs in the essay.

_____2. Number of sentences in the essay.

_____3. Number of sentences in the first developmental paragraph expressing opinion.

_____4. Number of sentences in the first developmental paragraph expressing facts.

5. Number of sentences per level of abstraction in the developmental paragraphs.

a. Level 1
b. Level 2
c. Level 3
d. Level 4
e. Level 5
f. Level 6
g. Level 7, or higher

_____6. Number of topic sentences at abstract Level 2, given the thesis as Level 1.

II. Indicate the total number of errors in each of the following categories.

_____1. Sentence fragment or run-on.

_____2. Incorrect pronoun reference or agreement.

_____3. Misplaced or dangling modifier.

_____4. Non-agreement of subject and verb.

_____5. Error in punctuation.

_____6. Error in mechanics.

_____7. Incorrect spelling.

_____8. Error in parallel construction or coordination.

_____9. Error in case of pronoun.

_____10. Error in verb form.

_____11. Modifier problem.

_____12. Anomalous syntax.

LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Long Beach City College

Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to English Composition Instruction: Phase Three

Background. Appraising the merit of a revised instructional program in pre-transfer English composition is the subject of a study that is being concluded at Long Beach City College. It is also the source of information for two earlier research reports. Phase one, in hasty review, evaluated the progress of two randomly selected populations of English composition students. One group was identified from enrollees in a new instructional program in English Composition (English 150 TBA) in the fall semester 1971. For control purposes, another group was obtained from students enrolled in the traditional review composition course (English 150) during the same semester. Mean scores on a standardized, objective English achievement test, obtained at the beginning and at the conclusion of the course, were compared. Also compared were the final grades earned in the two English composition courses.1/ A comparison of essays written as part of the final examination in the two instructional programs, spring semester 1972, was the subject for the second part of the evaluation.2/

In this third and final stage of the study, the achievement of the two populations identified for phase one has again been compared. This time, however, performance in transfer level English composition, English 1A, was studied for signs of a difference between the two populations. Some of the same criterion variables used in phase one were incorporated in the current investigation:

- The tendency to enroll in transfer English composition;
- The tendency to complete or persist in English 1A;
- The ratio of achievement grades earned (A, B, C, or Cr.);
- The ratio of penalty grades earned (D, F, or NCr.)

The number of students going directly into English 1A from pre-transfer level English composition in the spring semester 1972 was too small to yield statistically meaningful information. For this reason , data were gathered for those students in the sample population who entered English 1A in either the first or second semester after pre-transfer English composition. From the original sample populations, a total of eighty-eight (88) students entered English 1A.

Findings. The data generated by this investigation have been summarized in tabular form and appended to this report. The following observations are based on these data:

- Of those students in the sample populations, four students in ten (40 percent) entered a transferable English composition class within one year of the completion of the prerequisite course. (Table 2)

1/Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to English Composition Instruction: Phase One, Research Office Report, Long Beach City College, April 1972.

2/Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to English Composition Instruction: Phase Two, English Department Memorandum, Long Beach City College, January 1973.

- When compared to the TBA population, students from the "traditional" population demonstrated a greater tendency to enroll in the Transfer Composition course, English 1A. The difference between the two groups was calculated and found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. (Table 2)

- The proportions of male and female students in the sample populations, who continued into English 1A, were not significantly different from the distribution of the sexes found in phase one of the study. (Table 1)

- Whether a student had been enrolled in English 150 TBA or the "traditional" course seems to have had little bearing upon persistence to finish English 1A, or in subject achievement as reflected by final grades. No statistically significant difference was observed between English 1A students from the English 150 TBA population and the English 150 "traditional" population. When compared on a percentage basis the pattern of grades earned in English 1A is basically the same for the two populations. (Table 3)

Conclusion and Comments. Evidence generated in this phase of our evaluation does not change the picture suggested by the data from earlier studies of English 150 TBA. Instead, it seems to support the general impression that the "traditional" English 150 course and the new English 150 TBA course, in the final analysis, equally prepare students for transfer freshman English.

Reasons that might provide an explanation why proportionately more students from the "traditional" English 150 course enroll in transfer English composition are not found in the data collected in our investigation. It may be, however, that some of the factors influencing the student's choice in this instance are the same as those that governed his original selection. We might also speculate that the "traditional" English 150 course has some instrinsic quality which influences more of these students to continue into transfer freshman English.

Table 1

Students From Sample Populations Enrolled in English 1A
Spr. '72, Fall '73

	"Trad." Eng. No.	%	TBA Eng. No.	%	Diff.	X^2*
Male Students	27	56%	20	50%	6.0%	.137
Female Students	21	44	20	50		

*Chi square value at .05 level confidence > 3.84

* * * * *

Table 2

Tendency of Sample Populations to Enroll in English 1A
Spr. '72, Fall '73

"Trad." Eng. No.	%	TBA Eng. No.	%	Diff.	X^2
48	48%	40	34%	14.0%	3.88*

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

* * * * *

Table 3

Comparison of English 1A Grades Earned by Students in the
Sample Populations, Spr. '72, Fall '73

	"Trad." Eng. No.	%	TBA Eng. No.	%	Diff.	X^2*
Achievement (A, B, C, Cr.)	31	64.6%	27	67.5%	2.9%	.004
Penalty (D, F, NCr.)	2	4.2	2	5.0	.8	
Non-penalty (W, I)	15	31.2	11	27.5	3.7	.049
Totals	48	100.0%	40	100.0%		

*Chi square value at .05 level confidence > 3.84